DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 328 UD 031 817

AUTHOR Davis, Wanda M.
TITLE Educational Intervention: A Prescription for Violence at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.
PUB DATE [97]
NOTE 19p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Black Colleges; Black Students; Conflict Resolution; Cooperation; *Discipline Policy; Higher Education; *Intervention; *Mentors; *School Safety; Victims of Crime; *Violence

ABSTRACT

Data from campus crime reports and security logs help identify the perpetrators and likely victims of crime on college campuses. The historically black college or university campus is not exempt from physical and verbal acts of violence, and every area of the campus is vulnerable. Although the academy has no duty to protect the community from violence by a third party, taking no action to minimize risks makes for unsafe campus environments. It is no longer good enough to offer only services and programs that talk about victimization. A proactive response that interrupts the cycle of violence has been developed. This approach, called Educational Intervention (EI), addresses the disruptive behavior of perpetrators and assures that they understand their responsibility to the campus community. As a collaborative and structured educational experience that involves students and staff, EI gives the institution an opportunity to take a proactive role in student development, giving perpetrators the opportunity to examine their beliefs, values, and behaviors. EI is administered through the student conduct judiciary process and managed by professional staff. As a response to violent or intolerant behavior and a violation of the student behavior code, an agreement is reached between the judicial office and the student. Then a formal mentoring relationship is arranged between the student and the mentor. This relationship centers on an approved and agreed-on project or activity. A successful intervention attracts others who might be nominated as mentors and engages the entire community in a collaborative effort for safety. (Contains 1 table and 21 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 328

Educational Intervention: A Prescription for Violence at Historically Black College and Universities

Wanda M. Davis

State University of New York

College at Buffalo

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Wanda M. Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD031817

Campus crime reports and security logs provide researchers with reports on the nature of campus violence. These data help us to identify the perpetrator and the likely victim. The Historically Black College/University campus is not excluded. Physical and verbal acts of violence and intolerance that cause harm to another person have become all too familiar. Every area of the campus is vulnerable. Although the academy has no duty to protect the community from violence from a third party, taking no action to minimize the risk makes for an unhealthy and unsafe campus environment. It is no longer good enough to offer only services and programs that talk about victimization. Educational Intervention (EI) is a proactive response that interrupts the cycle of violence. It addresses the disruptive behavior of perpetrators and assures that they understand their responsibility to the campus community.

Education Intervention provides the institution with an opportunity to take a proactive role in student development. This is particularly important with violent behavior. It provides perpetrators with the opportunity to examine their values, beliefs, verbal or nonverbal behavior and levels of aggression. Consistent with the academic mission of the academy and the educational objective of student development, the EI is a collaborative and structured educational experience that involves students, staff, and faculty.

Campus crime reports and security logs provide researchers with information on the nature of campus violence. These data help us to identify the perpetrator and the likely victim. The Historically Black College/University campus is not excluded. Physical and verbal acts of violence and intolerance that cause harm to another person have become all too familiar. Every area of the campus is vulnerable. Although the academy has no duty to protect the community from violence from a third party, taking no action to minimize the risk clearly makes for an unhealthy and unsafe campus environment. It is no longer acceptable to offer only services and programs that talk about victimization; colleges and universities must become proactive. The institution of a program of Educational Intervention (EI) is a proactive response that interrupts the cycle of violence. It directly addresses the disruptive behavior of perpetrators and assures that they understand their responsibility to the campus community.

Realizing that most acts of violence go unreported and that issues and problems of the broader culture become ambient factors in the university community, the question then becomes, how can institutions of higher education provide a safer campus environment? How do we take back our campuses and control for violence? This is especially important as the larger society struggles with these very same concerns. Legal complexities and issues involving due process simply compound the problem. It is clear that violence and intolerant behavior in the academy can not be neglected or ignored.

Educational Intervention provides the institution with an opportunity to take a proactive role in student development as it relates to violent behavior. This intervention provides student services personnel with a tool that encourages perpetrators to examine their values, beliefs, verbal and nonverbal behavior and levels of aggression; as a result, they learn to modify their behavior. Consistent with the academic mission of the academy and the educational objective of student development, the EI is a collaborative and structured educational experience that involves students, faculty, and staff. This comprehensive intervention addresses the violent behavior of the perpetrator and provides educational experiences to help break the cycle of violence. Implemented

judiciously, the process can be used as an alternative to, or in conjunction with, disciplinary sanctions. The intended result is a less dangerous and more tolerant college campus.

National and international occurrences, pressing economic, political and social forces, and compelling events will continue to affect the African American college and university. Our campuses are not isolated, nor will there be only one way to respond to violent behavior. It is critical that we acknowledge the problems that face us and respond appropriately and decisively with structured programs to bring about civility on our campuses. This intervention is designed as a selective program geared toward working with those perpetrators who show a readiness to grow and to learn about respecting themselves and others.

Definition of Violence

For the purpose of this paper, violence is defined broadly. It includes physical violence, interpersonal violence , institutional violence, intellectual violence (O'Neil, 1984), courtship violence, hazing, the violent use of sex (Roark, 1987) and ethnoviolence (Reynolds & von Destinon, 1993). This widely framed definition is useful for two reasons. First, it reflects current thinking and research on campus violence. Second, it highlights the truly violent nature of many of the harmful student behaviors that student affairs professionals come across daily. It forces student affairs professionals to think critically about how they define and respond to violence on their campuses (Shang & Stevens, 1988).

In the last decade, violence has been studied intensely by student affairs professionals, counselors, legal scholars and academicians. This vast body of research, provides a clear picture of the status of violence in higher education and highlights current trends.

The trend in research on violence in higher education currently focuses on models of prevention and responses to violence and victimization. Researchers appear to be frustrated with studying demographics and charting trends alone. Now, they are

determined to prevent the antithesis of student development (Roark, 1987). It is apparent, however, that very little has been written on what to do with the perpetrator once an offense has been committed.

Lederman (1994 and 1995) reports a rise in criminal acts on college campuses, including those involved in off campus violence, which, in some cases have resulted in students dying. In an effort to shed light on the legal complexities involving a student who has been charged but not convicted of a crime, Snow and Thro (1994) and Smith (1992) examine the case of Nero v. Kansas State University wherein an accused perpetrator remains on campus pending trial on a sexual assault charge and commits a second violation prior to the hearing. Snow's and Smith's work provide a solid rationale for interventions directed specifically toward the accused.

In order to design interventions targeted towards the accused, it is valuable to construct a profile of individuals who are likely to commit violent acts. Stith, Jester and Bird (1992) provide some insight into the minds of those who commit violent acts; however, a larger sample would make the study more valuable. Relatively few articles address violence on the Historically Black college or university campus.

Hayes (1994 and 1995) stresses the need for campus safety and prevention of violence on the Historically Black campus. She argues that the burden of prevention lies with the community. She contends that an educated community is more effective in prevention than an uneducated one. However, Hayes' study also focuses upon the victim, not individuals who commit violent acts. Meggett (1994) examines environmental factors that affect African American college and university students. Her thrust is in prevention programs for minority males and their families on the topic of violence and drug abuse. Meggett discusses the need for an intervention for violent offenders in her work; however, she does not provide an intervention model. Hayes (1994) and Meggett (1994) call for intervention procedures that will reduce the level of violence on the Historically Black college campus. The studies which follow also address the issue of violence prevention.

Roark (1987) outlines three levels of violence prevention. The first level is tertiary prevention, which is limiting the damage of violence and victimization that has already taken place through services for the victim. Secondary prevention is identifying existing problems and bringing about effective correction before further damage occurs. Primary prevention is preventing new cases of violence by addressing its causes and adjusting variables relating to the conditions that foster it. In addition, Reynolds, Lustgraaf and Bogar (1989) address several specific options that institutions can execute to reduce and prevent violence on their campuses. Roark (1988) offers a guide for preventing campus violence. Focusing upon violence prevention, assessment and planning, Roark provides five components that violence prevention efforts are likely to include. First, they raise awareness and knowledge. Second, they develop policies and procedures. Third, they implement educational programs for skill development and attitude change. Fourth, they serve the needs of past victims. Last, violence prevention models must change the environment to protect those who are at risk.

Targets of Campus Violence

Orzek (1989) outlines five general groups targeted for violence on college campuses. These groups include: self inflicted, partner or dating, residential community, members of out-groups, and unknown others. A student will commit violence against himself or herself by way of self-destructive behaviors, including: alcohol, drugs, eating disorders or suicide. Partner or dating violence manifests itself through verbal insults, physical slapping, punching or rape. The residential community may experience violence that includes harassment, stealing, hazing or vandalism. Members of an out-group and unknown others may experience a combination of many of the previously mentioned forms of campus violence.

The Victim

Palmer (1993) examines five groups who appear to experience the most frequent and serious acts of violence. Palmer's research consists of a survey of forty nine colleges and universities in thirty states covering approximately 141,000 students. The groups

identified were residence life paraprofessionals (resident assistants or their equivalent), women, racial or ethnically identified students, non-heterosexual students and Jewish students. Palmer's research is important because it identifies the resident assistant as a common target of violence. A fact that directors of residence life have known and possibly neglected for years.

The Perpetrator

Some groups are more prone to commit violence than others. Using Reynolds', et al. (1989) conceptualization of all violence as oppression, we understand that violence is often committed by members of privileged groups. Hence, victimization of historically oppressed groups as studied by Palmer (1993) becomes understandable. Palmer notes that when a member of a group is victimized, the perpetrator usually focuses upon gender, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or authority figures as it relates to job duties. This helps us to understand that most violence committed against women are perpetrated by men. Most violence committed against non-heterosexual students are perpetrated by heterosexuals. Particular to the African American community, issues of sexual harassment or assault, violence towards women and sexual orientation are generally overshadowed by the issue of race. The code of silence surrounding these problems on our campuses is alarming.

Hazing is another common form of violence on campuses. Hazing is defined by Roark (1987) as a violation of the common rules of decency. Hazing commonly occurs in groups such as athletic teams and Greek organizations. These types of groups perform initiations on their new members. Roark (1990) states that, people are at their best and worst in groups. Hazing of any kind certainly portrays the college and university community at its worst.

The Need for Educational Intervention (EI)

This section focuses on an educational intervention that is designed to address the *intent* and *action* of violent behavior. The following parameters will apply: Violence is

behavior which by intent, action, and/or outcome harms another person...The phrase contains three essential elements which can be emphasized differentially in terms of interventions, namely intent addressed through education, actions through judicial processes, and outcomes through counseling and other services (Roark, 1993).

The proposed educational intervention addresses each of these three elements. The components are expressed in figure one and provide a description of the proposed intervention model, including a discussion of its goals and educational objectives. The final section identifies minimal standards for administrative application.

Figure 1 lists each major component of the model and is followed by a brief description of the procedure. Every component must be operational before implementation and the process must be carefully monitored. A successful intervention will require flexibility and careful design because each experience is tailored to individual participants.

Insert Figure 1 about here

A Concept, Philosophy and Theory for Educational Intervention

For purpose of this paper, campus violence and intolerant behavior are discussed as acts toward or against an individual or group of individuals. Conceptually, we must first understand that any category of persons can become a target of violence and intolerance, although some are more susceptible than others. Additionally, we cannot be expected to control every aspect of campus life. The very nature of the college campus, its community, and the naiveté of our student population may contribute to victimization.

It is also important to understand that the open, trusting, and free nature of our college campus community can sometimes lead to opportunities for the victimization of others. For example, although we want our campuses to be safe, problems of safety and

security are tied to lighting, shrubbery covered walkways, evening classes and campus events. Victimization can also result from the behavioral and psychological problems that our students bring with them. Compound these problems with the flagrant use of alcohol and drugs, and one can see that opportunities for violence are created.

Educational and developmental objectives of the process are extremely important. Rooted in the very heart of the curriculum, this intervention is based on an understanding of the formal and informal path of the student experience. As described in the following illustration, learning takes place both inside and outside the formal classroom. We contend that the greater part of the student's development takes place outside the formal classroom; therefore, our model concentrates on the informal path of a student development. As illustrated students come to us with a set of predispositions. Once these dispositions interact with any combination of other variables such as the hidden curriculum, peer culture or individual life experience, the individual student is faced with a variety of choices. If these choices involve the use of violence, the institution has a right and responsibility to respond.

Every student who commits an act of violence will not benefit from such an educational intervention; therefore, the decision to accept a case for referral to EI must be made by a professional on a case by case basis. After examining the intent of the student's behavior, only those who show promise and a willingness to participate in the intervention are invited to take part. All others will go through the normal student judicial process. By formal contract, it is also understood that failure to successfully complete the EI could result in the student's return to the campus judicial process.

A Statement of Goals

Used as an educational alternative to, or in combination with traditional disciplinary sanctions, the E I acts as a supplemental sanction for documented acts of violence and intolerance. Administered through the student conduct judiciary process and managed by professional staff, the goals of E I are to make more hospitable the

climate and learning environment on the campus, to create an educational intervention for violent behavior, to expand disciplinary sanctions to include educational experiences, to create a partnership with members of the campus community in support of educational intervention, and to build a comprehensive response to violence that includes persons from different sectors of the campus. Perhaps most significantly, the goal is to provide an experience and atmosphere where students explore differences in attitudes, values, beliefs and appropriate ways of responding to their own anger.

Educational Interventions are not intended to coerce, indoctrinate or force a change in the attitude of those involved. Rather, by design, the educational intervention will expose the perpetrator to new materials, information, knowledge and points of view. Through this exercise, the student is permitted to compare previously learned attitudes, beliefs and behavior with other standards of thinking and behavior. As a direct result of the exposure to the EI, the violators attitudes, beliefs and behavior may change.

Program and Educational Objectives

Although expected outcomes may vary for each participant, at minimum, a number of major objectives can be identified. Those who participate will be afforded the opportunity to examine the similarities that enhance and differences that impede communication across cultural boundaries. Students involved will examine their beliefs, attitudes and values and explore how they contribute to violent, ethnocentric, homophobic, racist, sexist, or other prejudicial behaviors. Participants will also examine their role in perpetuating or eradicating social inequity. Through a formal contract among student, mentor, and the institution, a learning environment is created where students can develop more affective communication skills. Students are also invited to devise a strategy for more affective interaction, particularly where violence or intolerance is apparent. Of even greater importance to the institution, a systematic response that includes educational intervention for inappropriate behaviors will be in place. Through EI, the institution's commitment to promote an environment free of violence and intolerance will be evident to its publics.

Simply put, the educational objectives involve three levels of development. First, the cognitive area refers to the acquiring of knowledge. When students are exposed to new or different material, we expect they will come to know more. Second and third, given this additional knowledge, we hope that their affective development will help them behave accordingly. The next section briefly describes necessary minimal standards for implementation of the educational initiative called EI.

Administration of the Program

Imperative to the success of this initiative is a clear designation of responsibility for the following major program areas: management and administration of the overall program, coordination of the educational intervention process, selection and training of mentors, and maintenance of a resource library.

Management of the overall program should be entrusted to a staff member who has responsibility for enforcing the student conduct code. Placing the educational initiative congruent with other rules, regulations, and policies that govern student behavior provides an excellent point of institutional response to campus violence and intolerance. Second, EI should be administered through a program coordinator. Cases referred from the student conduct office for educational initiative will then be carefully monitored. Selection, training and participation of mentors is one of the most important components of the model. In a successful program the EI coordinator will be largely responsible for this area.

A third and very important element of the intervention is that of the trained mentor. Central to a successful mentoring relationship is the concept of self directed learning. Through this process, with the mentor's assistance, participants remain in control of their learning. This guided learning approach, makes possible the transfer of attitudes, behaviors and skills. (Barr, 1993)

Selecting and Training the Mentor

As a response to violent/intolerant behavior and a violation of the student behavior code that has been proven, an agreement is reached between the judicial office and the student. Next, a formal mentoring relationship is arranged between the student and the mentor. This relationship is based on the student's need to complete an educational intervention. The relationship between the student, mentor and judicial office must be built around the completion of an approved and agreed upon project or activity that is all put to writing. Even if there are only two or three meetings between mentor and student, the EI process will take time, effort, and commitment from both the student and the mentor. Consequently, the mentor needs to be carefully selected and trained so that valuable time will not be spent unnecessarily. It is equally important that EI mentors be selected from both administrative and faculty pools.

Selection should begin with involvement from the president, provost, dean or department chair and should cross ethnic, gender, religious and sexual orientation lines. It is further recommended that mentors be chosen from outside the student affairs profession. This adds credibility, depth and breath to the educational process. Developing a pool of well-trained mentors who are committed to educational intervention will strengthen the opportunity for growth and development of the individual student. It will also provide the institution with a positive means for responding to campus violence. A successful educational intervention will attract others who might be nominated as mentors as well as engaging the entire community in a collaborative effort to make the campus safer and less threatening. In the end, the campus environment will be improved for all students.

Drawing upon the complex theories of self-development and self directed learning, mentoring can be a vital component to an educational process. Through mentoring, a learning environment can be created for Educational Intervention. It is important to understand that not all students who engage in violent or intolerant behavior will be afforded this opportunity. This decision begins with the judicial office and must

be agreed to by the student. If the contract agreement is not upheld satisfactorily, the student runs the risk of going back through the traditional judicial system. The following section explains the process in more detail.

A Process of Educational Intervention

Once a student has been identified as being in violation of a conduct code, along with having exhibited violent or intolerant behavior, the case is evaluated for possible assignment to an E I. The assignment is then registered with the conduct office and an evaluation or intake is performed by the program coordinator. The coordinator contacts a mentor to discuss an educational experience tailored to the special needs of the student consistent with the severity of the infraction. This sequence of meetings needs to be double checked. After meeting with the coordinator, the student meets with the mentor.

Within the first two meetings and a specified period of time, the student and mentor tailor the contract. The resource center library discussed later in this section will be beneficial at this stage. Because the contract is signed by both parties, the student becomes central to his or her own learning process. It is the student's responsibility to obtain the correct signatures both at the beginning and end of the contract. The mentor can meet, talk with, or visit with the student or coordinator as needed. However, the intervention must be completed within a period specified in the initial contract and the coordinator conducts the final follow-up session with the student. Questions about the process lie with the coordinator, while final disposition is the responsibility of the judicial office.

Resource Center Library

A collection of readings, videos, games, equipment and other educational materials is made available for use through the resource center library. Materials to be collected and maintained will be important to the design and ultimate effectiveness of the intervention.

The materials should reflect the goals and objectives of the educational intervention. That is, they should provide students with an opportunity to examine their

values and beliefs, verbal and non verbal language and their activities as they relate to violent and intolerant behavior. Supplementing the holdings of the library with campus activities or involvement in program implementation is also suggested.

In the beginning, the resource center library materials should address at minimum the issues of violence focusing on: intercultural communication, sexual orientation and women. Sub-categories such as alcohol, drugs and abusive relationships could be the next grouping. Once established, the center holdings should grow to reflect the nature of violence that exists on the individual campus. The success of the intervention for the participant, the program and the institution will be uninterrupted. As with any library, this one will need a key person to monitor, distribute, and purchase materials. Establishment of a tripartite steering committee can assess the quality and effective use of library holdings. It is recommended that materials be categorized by type as they relate to violence. It is important to understand that this intervention is aimed at prevention, and the experience is geared toward working with perpetrators as they examine their role in either fostering or eradicating social injustice. Through this structured agreement, students plainly develop and devise a strategy for more effective and appropriate behavior.

Program Assessment

The intent of this E I is not to "brainwash" or manipulate attitudes but to require student exposure to new information, knowledge and points of view. After this experience, students should be able to compare their previously learned values, attitude and behavior with a new and different set of ethics for thinking and acting. Attitudinal change often occurs over time and therefore attitudes and values may not be completely apparent at the end of the EI. However, the quality of the experience should change behavior. Referral to personal evaluation and focus groups can further help to assess individual growth and development.

Assessment can also be based on feedback from mentors. As with focus groups, identification of problems, concerns and success will be followed-up with action by the

coordinator. Direct response from students is also important. Remember, the process is as important as what students consciously learn from the experience. Although concrete learning may come later, the violator will learn to handle violence and intolerance in a more interpersonally effective manner.

Through this process of E I mentors will have increased confidence in themselves and the very important role they have. As the institution realizes it can make a difference in students' lives, and that it can effectively combat campus violence and intolerance, this process of E I can be successfully incorporated on any campus.

Conclusion

Campus violence is an exceedingly serious problem facing today's colleges. Physical and verbal acts of violence and intolerance that cause harm to another person have become all too familiar. Every area of the campus is vulnerable and innumerable members of the campus community fall prey to this national problem. Educational Intervention is a proactive response that interrupts the cycle of violence by addressing the disruptive behavior of perpetrators and assuring that they understand their responsibility to the community. What has been presented is merely one response for addressing violence on our African American college campus. It is designed as a selective program geared toward working with those perpetrators who show a readiness to grow and to learn about respecting themselves and others.

Figure 1

Components of EI Model

Concept Theory Philosophy Objectives	Resource Library Materials Distribution Purchase of New Materials Monitoring Resources
Administration of Program Mentors Selection of Mentors Training	Overall Program Assessment Minimun Standards (i.e. # of contacts with mentor) Monitoring Various Components

References

Barr, M. J. & Associates (1993). Student affairs administration. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Hayes, D. W. (1994). Violence another burden for some HBCU's. Black Issues in Higher Education, 10, 22-25.

Hayes, D. W. (1993). Campus violence upsurge forces legislation, student initiatives. Black Issues in Higher Education, 10, 20-22.

Lederman, D. (1995). Colleges report rise in violent crime. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 41:21, A41-A42.

Lederman, D. (1994). A tragic toll. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 41, A35-A36.

Meggett, L. L. (1994). Unfinished business. Black Issues in Higher Education, 11, 24-26.

O'Neil, R. M. (1989, October 18). Colleges should seek educational alternatives to rules that override the historic guarantees of free speech. The chronicle of higher education, B1, B3.

Orzek, A. M. (1989). Campus violence and campus discrimination. American College Personnel Association.

Palmer, C. J. (1993). Violent crimes and other forms of victimization in residence halls. Asheville, NC: College Administration Publications, Inc.

Reynolds, A. L. & von Destinon, M. (eds.) (1993). Campus violence manual. American College Personnel Association.

Reynolds, A., Lustgraaf, M. & Bogar, C. (1989, January). Institutional response to campus violence. ACPA Developments, 4.

Roark, M. L. (1993). Conceptualizing campus violence: Definitions, underlying factors and effects. Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 18, 1/2, 1-27.

Roark, M. L. (1990, April). Nevitt Sanford on violence. From: The ethics of campus violence interventions: Going beyond prevention. Paper presented at a meeting

of the American College Personnel Association, St. Louis, MO.

Roark, M. L. (1988). Guide for preventing campus violence. American College Personnel Association.

Roark, M. L. (1987). Preventing violence on college campuses. Journal of Counseling and Development, 65 (7), 367-371.

Sanford, N. (1972). Collective destructiveness: Sources and remedies. In G. Used (Ed.), Perspectives on Violence. (33-87). New York: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Scher, M. & Stevens, M. (1987). Men and violence. Journal of Counseling and Development, 65, 351-354.

Shang, P. & Stevens, M. (1988, August). Standing committee on campus violence. ACPA Developments, 3.

Smith, M. C. & Smith, M. D. (1992). Revisiting campus insecurity: A broader brush is essential. Journal of Law and Education, 22 (2), 189- 196.

Snow, B. A. & Thro, W. E. (1994). Redefining the contours of university liability: The potential implications of Nero v. Kansas State University. West's Educational Law Journal, 3(4), 541-557.

Stith, S. M., Jester, S. B. & Bird, G. W. (1992). A typology of college students who use violence in their dating relationships. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 411-421.